

**A RECORD OF *CYDIA INJECTIVA* (HEINRICH)  
(LEPIDOPTERA: TORTRICIDAE) FROM NORTH ABERDEENSHIRE**

K. R. TUCK

*The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD*

AND M. R. YOUNG

*University of Aberdeen, Tillydrone Avenue, Aberdeen AB9 2TN.*

In December 1992 Mr Michael Innes found two live adults of a tortricid moth in his home in Peterhead, North Aberdeenshire (vice-county 93). He collected one of these and subsequently it was identified at The Natural History Museum, London, as being a North American species, *C. injectiva*. According to Heinrich (1926) the larva of this species feeds in cones of *Pinus* species, particularly *P. jeffreyi*, and has been recorded from California, Oregon and North Carolina.

A search for the origin of Mr Innes's specimens revealed that his wife had acquired, as decorations, a number of large pine cones from a friend who had recently visited America. One of these cones had several obvious cocoons between its scales and one of the cocoons had pupal exuviae projecting from it. The cone was submitted for identification to Dr Ian Brown, University of Aberdeen, and proved to be from *Pinus jeffreyi*. Unfortunately none of the other cocoons produced moths, but there seems little doubt that these were the source of Mr Innes's specimens.

*C. injectiva* (Fig. 1) has a wingspan of 15–17 mm. It is a dark greyish brown species with two prominent paler metallic bands across its forewing and is thus unlikely to be mistaken for any British species of *Cydia*. A closely related Nearctic species, *C. piperana* (Kearfott), has an identical biology (Heinrich, 1926) and might also be imported accidentally with pine cones. It is slightly larger than *C. injectiva* and has a more pointed apex to the forewing. The pale bands across its forewing are narrower than in *C. injectiva* and contrast more strongly with the ground-colour of the wing.

Following display of the specimen of *C. injectiva* at the annual exhibition of the British Entomological and Natural History Society on 30 October 1993, Mr Harry Beaumont mentioned that two female specimens of this species were found in a conservatory at Dronfield, Sheffield (vice-county 63) early in 1982 by a lady, a relative of whom had given her some decorative pine cones from the west coast of the USA.



Fig. 1. *Cydia injectiva* (Heinrich).

One of these specimens is now in Mr Beaumont's collection; the location of the other is uncertain.

Mr Innes has kindly donated his specimen of *C. injectiva* to the collection of The Natural History Museum, London.

#### REFERENCE

Heinrich, C. 1926. Revision of the North American moths of the subfamilies Laspeyresinae and Olethreutinae. *Bull. U.S. Natn. Mus.* **132**: 1–216.

### BOOK REVIEW

**Dorset hoverflies** by D. A. Levy, E. T. Levy and W. F. Dean, with illustrations by M. J. Levy, published by the authors in association with the Dorset Environmental Records Centre, 1992, 73 pages, paperback, £3.95.—This is the latest county atlas for hoverflies, following on from previous publications for Essex, Staffordshire and Warwickshire. All such atlases are labours of love, though none convey the passion that can be derived from hoverfly recording as much as this one. The booklet provides a brief introduction to hoverflies written for the layman, a section on the history of hoverfly recording in Dorset (with special reference to J. C. Dale, F. H. Haines, C. D. Day, Capt. C. Diver and the Harwoods) and brief accounts of a locality and species of special interest. The remainder of the booklet consists of approximately 200 species maps and species accounts arranged four per page. The maps use a 10-km square grid, though with four dots per square (i.e. 5-km square units). This provides a far better indication of frequency at a county level than 10-km square units. Unfortunately the maps fail to make a distinction between modern and old records, using solid black circles throughout.

The species accounts are short but informative, providing information on Dorset status and habitat preferences, Dorset flight periods, and an indication of when the species was first recorded in the county.

Unfortunately the text is slightly marred by a small number of spelling mistakes, inconsistencies, questionable interpretations of data and minor inaccuracies. Does the expression 'common in many varied habitats' actually mean 'common, utilizing a wide variety of habitats'? It seems strange that *Xylotina nemorum* and *Sericomyia lappona* are termed 'locally common' when other species with a similar spread across the county and similar number of new and old localities, such as *Brachypalpoidea lenta* and *Volucella inflata*, are termed 'scarce', 'local and thinly spread' etc. Does *Anasinyia lineata*, which has semi-aquatic larvae and a strong association with marshes and water margins elsewhere in Britain, really favour 'heaths and grassland' in Dorset, or is this just clumsy interpretation?

The authors are not shy of challenging accepted thinking and expressing their own opinions, which is a healthy state of affairs in British dipterology. The most controversial statement concerns the attempted sinking of *Cheilosia griseiventris* as a subspecies of *C. intonsa*. This will be widely rejected by dipterists familiar with both species, even if females are particularly troublesome to separate. The use of the subspecies category is itself a contentious matter in such circumstances, and one has to question whether it is within the realms of a non-refereed publication to attempt nomenclatural revision.

Aside from these criticisms, this is a very welcome publication with much new information.

STEVEN J. FALK